



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

no higher duty than that which he owes to the whole empire. Those who wish to understand the causes of Bismarck's ultimate fall in 1890 will seek for it in vain in the memoirs of the Iron Chancellor or in the writings of those who regard him as having been sacrificed to the ambition of his emperor. Bismarck was successful so long as his duties lay in exercising the talents which had earned for him the nickname of Iron Chancellor. When, however, after the adoption of the federal imperial constitution, other qualities besides those of the man of iron were needed, Bismarck commenced to move gently downward through a series of political errors which even he, with the whole machinery of a servile press and bureaucracy, could not wholly conceal from the public or from the penetrating eyes of the present Emperor. On this theme Lasker in the little work we are discussing throws many interesting side-lights.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

Studies in Contemporary Biography. By JAMES BRYCE. (New York : The Macmillan Company ; London : Macmillan and Company. 1903. Pp. ix, 487.)

THIS volume is intended especially for the general reader, but is also worth the careful attention of the historical student, not only because any fragment of Mr. Bryce's work is of interest, but because a historian who is also a prominent man of affairs here presents us with the cream of his personal experience in studies of the most prominent figures among his associates in the English public and scholastic life of the later nineteenth century. The selection may seem at times a somewhat arbitrary and uneven one, and from the point of view of the adequate representation of the author's notable contemporaries there are certainly important omissions; this is apparently due not only to the confining of attention to those who have died, but also to the degree in which the writer was guided by the element of personal knowledge. The list bears striking testimony to the wide extent of the interests and friendships of Mr. Bryce, since with most of the men here treated he was on an intimate footing. One or two names (as that of Edward Bowen, an assistant master at Rugby) that are unknown outside of comparatively narrow English circles are included. In the effort, as the author says, "to do what a friend can do to present a faithful record of their excellence which may help to keep their memory fresh and green." One is not inclined to cavil at such an effort, especially as in the case of Bowen the sketch serves to set strongly before the non-English (and particularly the American) reader how in England even a subordinate teacher in a great public school may in some degree become a national figure. We are warned in the preface that "these studies are not to be regarded as biographies even in miniature. My aim has rather been to analyse the character and powers of each of the persons described, and as far as possible, to convey the impression which each made in the daily converse of life."

There are in all twenty studies: Lord Beaconsfield, Dean Stanley, T. H. Green, Archbishop Tait, Anthony Trollope, J. R. Green, Sir

George Jessel, Lord Cairns, Bishop Fraser, Sir Stafford Northcote, Parnell, Cardinal Manning, E. A. Freeman, Robert Lowe, W. Robertson Smith, Henry Sidgewick, E. E. Bowen, E. L. Godkin, Lord Acton, W. E. Gladstone. Critical examination is not necessary to show that we are under a large debt to Mr. Bryce for these studies. They are primarily records of the impressions made by recent famous Englishmen upon one of the most distinguished of their associates, a man who is also one of the most keen and cosmopolitan observers of his time; as such they could not fail to be helpful. They are all marked by insight and candor; whether Mr. Bryce is writing of close friends or of those (as Parnell) whom he evidently was not prepared to admit to his friendship, we can have no suspicion of his entire fairness. There is still evidence of special research, but this is in entire keeping with the aim of the author and the desire of the intelligent reader; even if the time had come for elaborate biographical labor in these cases, and even if we could desire Mr. Bryce to give his time to this, it is improbable that such effort would have made the sketches any more worth while to us. They are all carefully written, are in a high degree interesting, and are frequently marked by felicitous phrases and characterizations, by keen distinctions and telling generalizations. Not infrequently, too, we find valuable additions to our information on recent events from the vantage-ground of the author's inside knowledge; as when we are told of Parnell that "he had no grasp of constitutional questions, and was not able to give any help in the construction of a Home Rule scheme in 1886" (p. 230).

Two of the papers much exceed the others in extent and are manifestly the fruit of special effort — that on Disraeli, which opens the volume, and that on Gladstone, which closes it. There is nothing startling in either, but both are acute and penetrating and throw much light upon the men; it is not strange, perhaps, that neither is quite satisfying. The Disraeli one is somewhat unsympathetic, and it may be doubted whether Mr. Bryce was in a position to observe very fully or quite adapted to comprehend fully this baffling figure. He tells us in the preface that he did not know him personally. In the case of Gladstone one cannot but suspect our author of being still in some degree under the glamour of his great leader, and one doubts whether Gladstone will continue to hold in English annals the place that Bryce would assign him. However that may be, nothing could be more open-minded than the manner in which he discusses natures and careers the complexity and problems of which he feels very strongly; and no student of these men will do well to neglect his analyses. Next to these the most interesting sketches for students of history will probably be those of J. R. Green, Freeman, and Lord Acton. Green he rates as a great historian, much higher than the later period of distrust has left him; his comments on Freeman do not provoke dissent; and he throws some new light on the dim and attractive figure of Lord Acton.

On the whole it must be acknowledged that Mr. Bryce was fortunate in his friends, and that this group of latter-day Englishmen seem for the

most part to have been as wholesome and attractive in their personalities and personal relations as they were effective and vigorous in their life-work. Great and little, they form a pleasant and stimulating company.

VICTOR COFFIN.

England, India, and Afghanistan. An Essay upon the Relations, Past and Future, between Afghanistan and the British Empire in India. [The Le Bas Prize Essay, 1902.] By FRANK NOYCE, B.A. (London: C. J. Clay and Sons; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. xii, 174.)

THIS book, as the title indicates, is a monograph treating historically of one phase or division of the problem of Asia. The author deserves congratulations because of the motive with which the task was undertaken and because in no other place within so small a compass, certainly, has the question of Afghanistan in its unity been described for the student of world politics. Beginning with a brief introductory survey of the earlier relations of Afghanistan to India, Mr. Noyce summarizes in twenty pages the disastrous history of the first Afghan War. The middle period, from 1842 to 1875 (pp. 32-69), is followed by chapters on the second Afghan War, on the reign of Abdur Rahman Khan (1880-1901), and on the present state and future prospects of the problem. In the opening pages the author rightly points out the difficulty which the results of party government often place in the way of the investigator in modern foreign politics. A large part of the literature dealing with almost any British imperial interest of the last century has been affected not merely by national prejudice but by party rancor; thus even if ability and opportunity for accurate information be granted in certain writers, it may be necessary to discover their views concerning Parliamentary reform, the adoption of free trade, or Irish home rule, in order to judge whether their conclusions with respect to Papineau's rebellion, the labor question in Jamaica, or the Armenian massacres can be accepted as non-partizan. In this respect if not in others this book is safe; for the reviewer has tried in vain to discover the author's party affiliation. But, though praise and blame are on the whole fairly distributed to the various agents of the unstable policies evolved between Westminster and Simla, the general impression gathered is that national prejudice has not been so successfully eliminated. Aside from phrases here and there such as that found on p. 173 ("the contempt of the Mahomedan (*sic*) religion they [the Russians] have shown in Central Asia"), which is erroneous, the author has failed to realize that his inadequate treatment of Russian policy, which amounts almost to an exclusion, must result in the mystification of the reader as to the inwardness of Central Asian politics. The lack of any save English authorities (the *Autobiography of Abdur Rahman Khan* excepted) in the very short bibliography is further evidence of the insular attitude of the author, while such a reference as occurs on p. 124 to the "untutored Oriental" should certainly give pause.